DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 154 TM 034 761

AUTHOR	Lincoln, Yvonna S.; Cannella, Gaile S.
TITLE	Qualitative Research and the Radical Right: Cats and Dogs and Other Natural Enemies.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Diversity; Evaluation Methods; *Political Influences; *Qualitative Research; *Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS	Deconstruction; *Radicalism

ABSTRACT

This investigation was conducted to explore contemporary critiques that challenge the growing body of scholarly research that would reveal and support diverse understandings of the world. Principal methods for this deconstruction of contemporary critiques include document analysis of writing that examines content and author location and context and the juxtaposition of recent academic critiques of qualitative inquiry with political discourses and actions from a broader societal perspective than academia in the time period surrounding the emergence of perspectives that challenge the existence of universalist truth. The analyses demonstrate a lack of knowledge about diverse views of research and methods by those who are providing the criticisms. Integrated with that lack of knowledge is a fear of diversity and the beliefs that scholarly "sound bites" and the confusions of content can be used to control the values and expectations of others. It is apparent that more penetrating deconstructive analyses might be conducted to elucidate the politicization of research. (Contains 43 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

0083

ED 473 154

Qualitative Research and the Radical Right: Cats and Dogs and other Natural Enemies

Yvonna S. Lincoln
University Distinguished Professor of Higher Education
and Ruth Harrington Chair of Educational Leadership
EAHR Department, 511 Harrington Tower
4226 TAMU, Texas A&M University
E-mail: ysl@tamu.edu

and

Gaile S. Cannella
Professor, Educational Psychology
EPSY Department, 710 Harrington Tower
4225 TAMU, Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4225
E-mail: g-cannella@tamu.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Y. S. Lincoln
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

TM034761

Paper prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, April 1-5, 2002.
Comments welcome and encouraged, but please do not cite or quote without permission from either author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Qualitative Research and the Radical Right:
Cats and Dogs and other Natural Enemies

Qualitative researchers have long grown accustomed to answering for the kinds of research they produce to a variety of audiences: experimental researchers, philosophical positivists and post-positivists, statisticians, and others, many of whom simply do not understand the purposes, practices, products, or methods of qualitative research. This is not difficult to understand, as many senior researchers were never exposed to qualitative research training in graduate school, had few models to study, and have established for themselves strong reputations utilizing conventional research methods and models. In the same vein, the attachment of educational research to earlier psychology models, which, in the early part of the 20th century adopted behavioristic models from the natural sciences, creates a social infrastructure which precludes easy acceptance of a-experimental, or qualitative, methods or non-conventional paradigms, for research. Despite the strong social norms surrounding rationalistic, or conventional, research, educational researchers have won for themselves a mature and sophisticated multi-paradigmatic social context, and the freedom to engage in research utilizing a variety of models and methods. The result has been a rich, multi-perspectival body of research, illuminating aspects of educational processes previously unseen or unremarked or deemed unable to be investigated.

Given this set of circumstances, it is especially curious and interesting to see growing attacks on qualitative research seemingly from the political right, anti-feminists, and critics in higher education who view the culture wars as exemplary of how the university is being undermined from the left.. Wilson's (1999) beliefs are an excellent example as he posits that "Identity politics, radical feminism, multiculturalism, educating for difference, postmodernism and deconstruction (p. 15)" are destroying the university. Research that has opened the door to different ways of experiencing, viewing, and understanding the world has been labeled "irrationalist and anti-humanist." Specifically, as qualitative representations of the "lived experiences" of minorities, women, and the poor plus qualitative examinations of regimes of truth (as embedded with Western, patriarchal thought) gain visibility and even prominence, a counter discourse filled with disqualifying messages seems to be emerging.

Description of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation was and is to problematize contemporary critiques that challenge the growing body of scholarly research that would reveal and support diverse understandings of the world. This philosophical view of research directly questions regimes of truth (even the belief in science) and includes a variety of methods and forms of interpretation that are qualitative, naturalistic, historical, emergent, shifting, and changing. This analysis of contemporary critiques includes the following issues:

Why has qualitative research been linked with other perspectives labeled as "evils" undermining the academy? (Is it because so many qualitative researchers adopt a postmodern perspective? What are the links between diversity studies, feminist

3 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

theory, multiculturalism, postmodernism, post-structuralism and qualitative research?)

Who is mounting the attack on qualitative research and what methodologies are being used?

Having made so many gains, what is the future of qualitative research in education if the political right lumps such research with other despised theoretical and applied studies?

Those who argue that we might well substitute "liberal" for "conservative" and vice versa somewhat miss the point. In some sense, it is the Pascal's paradox of liberal and conservative politics and policy. If we accept the conservative agenda, the social world changes very little. If we accept the liberal political and policy agenda, the world becomes a bit messier. The simple question is, Whose politics enfranchise, and whose politics disenfranchise? With the conservative political agenda, many citizens are left behind. The liberal political and policy agenda leaves fewer behind. Consequently, while there are, admittedly, strident politics on both sides, one agenda—the liberal agenda—tends to enfranchise more of those previously disenfranchised, and the other agenda—the conservative agenda—tends to perpetuate disenfranchisement. The issue is therefore not one of whose agenda is the more passionate; it is, rather, whose agenda fosters the democratic ideal and social justice.

Modes of Inquiry and Data Sources

Principal methods for this deconstruction of contemporary critiques include: (1) Document analyses of contemporary writing that examines content and also author location, and context; and (2) Juxtapostion of recent academic critiques of qualitative inquiry with political discourses and actions (from a broader societal perspective than academia) during the historical time period that covers the years just before and since the emergence of perspectives on research that challenge the existence of universalist truth.

Background to the Problem

Wilson has declared that "the academy's current interest in diversity" is "dogmatic and partisan" (1999. p. 16). His voice is joined by others, including Bauerlein (2001) who declares that "Professors still waging a culture war against the Right live and work by the credo 'Always historicize!' Neo-pragmatists, post-structuralists, Marxists, and feminist insist upon the situational basis of knowledge, taking the constructionist premise as a cornerstome of progressive thought and social reform...[wherein] the standpoint functions as a party line..." (p. 1, emphases added). Koertge (1994) even purports that the reason there are still so few women in the hard sciences may be that "certain feminist stances [may] be part of the problem" (emphasis in original). Koertge asks why feminists are so opposed to science? Her answer is that "fundamental is their belief that the very methods of science predispose it to be more useful for evil than for good. For example, " she theorizes, "some feminist philosophers argue that the agenda of the 'hard' sciences has always been to dominate nature and to penetrate her secrets. The very process of analyzing the workings of natural systems is seen as intrinsically destructive....Such criticism of science seems so extreme that one might

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

imagine—or hope—that it would have little effect outside the hothouse environment of feminist theorizing. Unfortunately, though, it is gaining credibility".

What are we to make of such attacks on feminist theory, post-structuralism, neo-pragmatism, identity politics, multiculturalism, gender studies, qualitative research (Miller, 1999, Koertge, 1994) and other theoretical, literary and practical studies in the academy today? This is particularly pertinent when these scholars are buttressed by works gaining currency and a reading audience, such as the Kors and Silvergate work The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses, and Ellis's Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities, as well as various works now widely available from the National Association of Scholars, such as Thomas Short's "What Shall We Defend?" (Fall, 1999), or The Dissolution of General Education, 1914-1993, the multi-authored history of the decline and fall of the humanities and liberal education published by the NAS.

In educational research, says Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, a clear problem is the lack of "common patterns of training. If you don't have common patterns of training, it's hard to reach agreement on what research is, much less what good research is." But the problem which she outlines is taken to be "evident in the growing debate over rigor and methodology. Until the 1970s, education research was dominated by cognitive psychologists performing laboratory studies and conducting surveys on how students learned. Since then, more and more researchers have favored the qualitative techniques of anthropology, writing descriptive case studies....In practice, some scholars believe, education has not been well served by such varied methods of research....Qualitative research has been criticized for yielding little that can be generalized...too much useless work is done under the banner of qualitative research" (Miller, 1999, emphasis in first author's own; emphasis in second added). Lagemann, current president of the National Academy of Education, is "co-chairing a project to create common goals and standards for research" (Miller, 1999). The authors cannot locate any nationally-visible qualitative researchers who have been asked to join this group!

The so-called "culture wars" have been in progress, like some Orwellian mythic enemy, for over 20 years now. Graff's argument for the culture wars' utility has been that the arguments over the meaning of the Western canon, over literature, history, and the arts, has been instrumental in salvaging the arts from an overwhelmingly career-oriented curriculum (1992).[1] But for the first time in the culture wars—actually, a massive shift from a modernist world to a postmodern vision of the world—qualitative research as a tool, as a methodological strategy, as a product of research, has come under fire. The surprising element is that it has come under fire, not from its traditional detractors, experimentalists and educational psychologists, but from traditional opponents of postmodern theoretical perspectives and multiculturalism/diversity. The political right has taken aim at a set of methods and methodological tools which have supported the exploration of identity politics, postmodern perspectives on literary texts, the experiences of multiculturalism and other strategic social issues, but which are themselves, as tools, not politically aligned or loaded. Clearly, identifying the sources of the attacks and deconstructing them will enable qualitative researchers to understand more clearly the heart and soul of the political right's apparent fear of such methods.

The remainder of this work will proceed in three sections. First, we will try to establish how qualitative research became inextricably but inadvertently linked with other "academic evils" such as postmodernism, feminist theorizing, poststructuralism, the culture wars more broadly, the 'new historicism', multiculturalism and diversity, race and ethnic studies, and postcolonial studies, among others. Second, we will examine closely the methods and sources of attack. Where do such attacks come from? Who is funding these attacks? What is the general strategy for the attacks? What is the conceptual focus of the attacks? Third and finally, we will try to suggest several strategies, both conceptual and political, for answering the attacks on qualitative research, as well as reiterating the arguments for maintaining the central purposes of the university as they have been historically promulgated; that is, we will assert that free and open debate, in a democratic forum where all voices have a right to be heard, is critical to maintaining not only academic freedom, but also to establishing the Western universities as sites which support and uphold democratic principles.

Linking Qualitative Research to "Academic Evils"

There is no question but that there has been a political, as well as an academic, "backlash" against the political liberalism of the 1960s in the U.S. (Faludi, 1991). The hard-fought civil rights battles of the 60s, which won for African-americans a larger (if still proportionally small) piece of the American "pie" convulsed the country with riots, the murders of peaceful civil rights workers attempting to get blacks registered to vote and the assassinations of Medgar Evers and Martin Luther King. No sooner did the country return to some semblance of peacefulness when the demonstrations and riots over a hotly-contested war in Viet Nam begin. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Weather Underground added their own chaos to legitimate protest as the war ground on, prosecuted on color television at dinnertime throughout the homes of America. The war was effectively over—save for the mass killings—when four unarmed students were shot by the National Guard while peacefully protesting on the Kent State University campus in May, 1971. The American public turned against the war. It might have been okay to kill strange-looking people a half a world away, but it was murderous to turn on our own children with our own domestic army. The beginning of the end was in sight, or so it seemed.

The impulse to press for civil rights, however, had just begun, not ended, with the enfranchisement of millions of blacks. Women's right followed, superceded by a press for the rights of children, which in was followed hard by protests to achieve parity on a variety of domestic issues by gays and lesbians and subsequently, by postcolonial voices all over the globe. Into this yeasty and volatile civil strife—pursued on campuses as well as in public forums--leaped a variety of theoretical and cultural formulations, some homegrown, some imported from the French schools of literary criticism, psychology, sociology and cultural studies. Among these were feminist theorizing (both U.S. and continental strands), gay and queer studies (a U.S. phenomenon), the new literary criticism (a continental import, elaborated by U.S. scholars), the 'new historicism' (a revisionist school of historical studies brought to full flower in the U.S.), postmodern and poststructural theorizing (a continental import, although it is said that Lyotard only discovered postmodernism after his first visit to the U.S.), race/ethnic studies and postcolonial and subaltern studies (the former

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

originally an American contribution, the latter an intellectual contribution of colonial arenas and peoples).[2]

The explosion of civil rights issues and the intellectual flowering of new and emerging theoretical concerns, gave rise to an urgency around cultural issues more broadly, and a sense of the need for a new multicultural, pluricultural ethic more narrowly. It was, we believe, in this arena that multiculturalism was born, but also that issues around pluralism in American life and multiculturalism as an appropriate response to the withering of the melting-pot philosophy which had characterized the late 19th century and early 20th century were articulated. The strong stance of colleges and universities toward multicultural admissions procedures, and toward recognizing that the Western canon ignored many works of great value in understanding other cultures, other lifeways and other experiences of mainstream American life, helped to undermine the centuries-long hegemony of the canon as the mainstay of a liberal education. The "posts-" fed into curricular decisions in such a way as to enlarge the corpus of thought being offered on campuses, even while such curricular decisions (by no means perfect, we admit) were being excoriated in the popular press and media (see, for instance, Bloom, 1987; Kimball, 1991; D'Souza, 1991). In this way, new theoretical currents came to be associated with multiculturalism, and its imagined threats to some non-existent "purity" of American thought and language. As Levine (1996) characterizes the threat, "Fears of an eroding hierarchy and the encroachment of a democratic society into the academe, as reflected in both the curriculum and the student body, are at the heart of many of the critiques of contemporary higher education" (pp. 11-12).

The link between qualitative research and academic evils—in the form of threats to studies of western civilization, in particular—came about, we believe, for several reasons. First, qualitative research stands in opposition to the presumed "objectivity" of scientific methods which are largely experimental and quantitative. The pursuit of objectivity as a scientific criterion is now largely discredited by serious philosophers as a chimera, impossible to attain because objectivity itself is non-existent. Nevertheless, objectivity has become both a weapon and a shield. It is a weapon when it is evoked to discredit some forms of research as sloppy, non-rigorous, partisan, advocacy-oriented, biased, or subjective. It is a shield when marshaled as a defense against multiculturalism, or equity-oriented approaches to providing equal educational opportunity, for instance (see, for example, Herrnstein and Murray's The Bell Curve [1994], and one of its answering volumes, Measured Lies [Kincheloe, Steinberg and Gresson, 1996]). Objectivity thus pursued suggests that "the numbers don't lie", although sophisticated researchers—and members of the public with a critical faculty intact—know better.

Second, qualitative research is thus viewed as "subjective", and thereby, without rigor. The companion accusation, when objectivity fails to make its point, is that subjectivity is the downfall of qualitative research. Subjectivity-objectivity acts like many binaries in social and academic life: if research is not objective, then it must be subjective. Utilizing definitions derived from classical experimental science, then if objective research is putatively unbiased, then subjective research must be biased. While it is neither possible nor useful to examine those binaries here, and because others have done so ably and well (Reason and Rowan, 1981), suffice it to say that from Fred Kerlinger on, educational researchers who wished to conduct research outside of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

positivism's confines (whether as phenomenologists or as critical theorists) have contended with the labels of subjective and unrigorous. Much of the energy spent on qualitative methods has been spent in demonstrating conceptually, theoretically and politically that qualitative research is no less rigorous than more conventional research, and is probably more so, simply because it makes its premises, biases, predelictions and assumptions clear up front, whereas the values which undergird a more conventional piece of research may not be stated at all.

Third, qualitative research often undertakes the documentation of "lived experience", including in-depth exploration and uncovering of the lived experiences of oppression, social injustice, and failed social policies. Casting a spotlight on oppression within our own borders, highlighting instances of social injustice, or critically and microscopically examining failed social policies threatens the status quo, destabilizes taken-for-granted images of American life, and poses serious questions to a lulled public about the policies its various governments pursue (federal, state, local). Furthermore, the presentation of such research in 'natural language', i.e., accessible, cases and formats imperils the ability of knowledge elites to withhold or obfuscate real program effects. The status hierarchy of knowledge-producers as well as knowledge-consumers is endangered when ordinary citizens have access to clear and well-argued evidence for the success or failure of programs.

Fourth and finally, qualitative researchers have often aligned themselves with research interests around women's issues, issues associated with marginalized and silenced voices, with redressing imbalances of power (see, for instance, Guba and Lincoln, 1989, where one criterion for rigor is the extent to which those formerly without power are given voice in evaluation efforts), with the overthrow of injustice and/or oppression, and with other theoretical, conceptual and political frameworks within which research might be conducted. This fourth reason for the association of qualitative research with academic "evils" is likely the most powerful reason qualitative research has now become nearly as big a threat to the radical Right as multiculturalism. The deep levels of understanding of social phenomena associated with well-done qualitative research, as well as the deconstructive, probing nature of that understanding, prove a wedge of support for reform of existing social arrangements. Reform efforts once again threaten to topple extant regimes of power, and provide fodder for a right-wing backlash.

Thus, it is not a single event, but rather a confluence of events which has led to right-wing criticisms of qualitative research. Some of those events have been political, some theoretical, some conceptual, and some merely the result of neighborhood action, such as the women's consciousness-raising groups of the 70s. Few could reliably sort or weight the factors now; it is enough to see them as a set of forces so powerful, taken together, that the political right has felt it must marshal resources against them as a threat to some imagined way of life. Levine observes that what the political right feels it is protecting, "The western civilization curriculum sixties liberals are accused of dismantling," is to some extent a figment of the Right's imagination, since it "was out of favor before they ever became professors—and was itself the result of a government program after World War I to ensure that American values were taught in the university, not the result of politically neutral inquiry and consensus" (Levine, 1996, overleaf). The critical issue then is, from where do the attacks proceed, and how are they mounted?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sources and Methods of Attack

Just as the conservative right was not happy with gains made by women and other oppressed groups that would impose consideration for equity and diversity, ideologies and especially specific methodologies (in this case qualitative inquiry) that challenged dominant truths and created avenues for diverse voices were considered major threats. From within the context of these threats to their power (both perceived and real), the conservative right mounted an organized strategy to reconstitute a patriarchal, truth oriented status quo that would maintain power and control how difference was interpreted and accepted. This new right emerged in the late1970's as conservatives came to believe that their way of life was threatened, that a political imbalance in Washington represented a 'moral decay.' Incited to action by fears that people who represent difference were being heard in policy making arenas, new conservative right groups were formed. Beginning steps came with the founding of the Eagle Forum and Concerned Women for America, groups that feared gains made through the women's movement (Berry, 1997). These organizations claimed that groups like the National Organization for Women and issues like the Equal Rights Amendment, gay rights, and freedom of choice over one's body (the female body) were leading to a decline in the 'American Family' (a conservative 'fictional' family that was tied to the 1950's and assumed nuclear wedded bliss, happiness through patriarchal submission, and equal resources for all families; see S. Coontz, 1997, The Way We Really Are). In 1979, the Moral Majority was founded by Jerry Falwell with the purpose of mobilizing conservative Christians to become a presence in policy making regarding the right kind of family and other issues of difference and control. Although the Moral Majority never actually gained the power that had been hoped, the public dialogue and presence paved the way for the more successful Christian Coalition in the 1980's. This grassroots organization, with over 300 chapters around the United States (Broder, 1993; Lawton, 1992), has long claimed that "the Lord is going to give us this nation back one precinct at a time" (Moen, 1992, p. 108).

Along with special interest groups formed for purposes of creating a business lobby against continued liberal concern for environmental protection, these new right conservative groups joined with the Republication party to create a social movement that would counter 1960's and early 1970s social gains (Berry, 1997; Dowie, 1995; Herman, 1981). This invasive, expansive, purposeful, and sometimes even accidental coalition has worked for the past 30 years (Berry, 1997) to create societal conditions through which particular forms of reason would be constituted as legitimate and other forms of thought discredited, marginalized, and even demonized (Foucault, 1972). A massive social movement was created to counter another (Herman, 1981). While we do not contend that the movement was an 'evil conspiracy to get all liberals or anyone else who would attempt to promote equal rights and the appreciation of diversity,' we would propose that the movement was a set of planned strategies to counter gains made by those who have been traditionally oppressed and to maintain power (most often white, male, reasoned power). Further, we would propose that groups who may fear change for a variety of reasons, those of us who have been taught to perpetuate the oppression of members of our own group (like women), those of us who have constructed entire identities around particular notions of religious or scholarly truth, and those of us for whom the time required to understand the oppression of others is not possible (because of our own daily attempts to deal with the complexities of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

material survival) have been 'used' by those who would strive to create social movements that would reconstitute patriarchal power.

The attack has targeted American institutions like the media/technology, the judiciary, and academia. Methods involved: (1) the construction of discourses that would attempt to discredit difference or control the interpretation of difference; and (2) the creation and funding of an integrated intellectual network of power that would challenge discourses and institutions that foster diversity of thought and being. New right discourses call for standards and accountability and have created languages that are anti-feminist and mono-intellectual. Further, a network of power has been created through the construction of conservative philanthropies and think tanks designed to fund discourse, scholarship, and training that would support the conservative agenda (Covington, 1998). The success of this organized attack is evidenced in the politics of resentment (Crawford, 1980) toward any who would challenge the dominant discourse of "traditional values" from perspectives on the general welfare of citizens (especially if those citizens are poor women and their children) to diversity in academic research (the newly emerging voices of women and others who would challenge the "will to truth" embedded in academic research as construct). The attack is far reaching and has been so woven into the public's imagination that even individual members of American society who would not want to limit diverse voices have accepted conservative right discourses as truth. We could discuss these methods from a variety of positions, however, our examples today are specific to academia and qualitative inquiry.

Creating Discourses That Marginalize and Demonize

Perhaps the most obvious, yet also insidious, discourses that would disqualify diverse voices are those that reconstitute the hatred, superiority, and biases of the past. These discourses are already embedded within the misogyny that is patriarchy and the enlightenment legitimation of power for one group over another. In the academy (as well as society overall), those discourses are embodied in anti-feminist language and action and through a type of intellectualism that privileges truth, rigor, standards, and linearity – a type of mono-intellectualism. The conservative right have accepted, co-opted, and reconstituted these discourse methods for the purposes of discrediting academia in general, women as a power group in particular, and research methodologies that challenge their narrow, righteous truth oriented view of the world specifically.

Anti-feminism. Gains made during the women's movement seem to have been the most disturbing for the conservative right (Berry, 1997). The opposition has been/is both generalized and focused on specific issues. Although the dominant public issue has been abortion (Craig & O'Brien, 1993), the conservative right has blamed women for everything that they see as problematic for their idealized 'American family.' Outside academia, the right has been successful in eliminating most of the gains in influence on public policy made during the women's movement, gains predominately lost during the Reagan administration (Costain, 1992). This loss is even more obvious today as one examines the languages of welfare reform, right to life, economics, and the 'war' on terrorism.

Conservatives have taken up the gendered discourse of manliness, hard work, competition, and success through merit that has been the patriarchal montra used to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

support notions of U.S. superiority, pride and unity. One reason that the conservative right has been so successful in reconstituting dominant discourses in American society is that these perspectives are so embedded within the American psyche that the values and assumptions underlying them are not questioned (Stefancic & Delgado, 1996). Males and females alike accept and use the discourses without always recognizing the patriarchal will to power that is supported. Creating an environment (an academy that would value and accept diverse forms of research) in which the diverse voices of women are heard and in which women are seen as equal challenges this patriarchal power.

Recent experiences of women in the academy illustrate fear of creating just such an environment. This fear is obvious in attempts to maintain a patriarchal will to power in the academy and by the reconstitution of this will through rhetoric used by the conservative right. Some have labeled this discourse Antifeminism in the Academy (Clark, Garner, Higonnet, & Katrak, 1996) which describes "antagonisms toward feminist intellectual advance (p. x), a lothing that is present across gender lines. Antifeminism in academia is both part of the overall backlash against women's rights in society and the general conservative attempt to discredit the (at least somewhat) liberal research establishment found in American universities. Antifeminism is expressed in at least four ways: (1) the use of sound bites like 'political correctness' to discredit diverse academic voices; (2) planned attacks on feminist by women co-opted by the conservative right, co-opted for a variety of reasons and in a variety of ways; (3) old-style dismissal of women; and (4) old-style calls for standards and quality.

First, the work of such authors as Bloom, Kimball, and D'Souza have attacked academia in general as a site of liberal political correctness; this work has be especially focused on women and minorities. D'Souza's interpretation of "diversity, tolerance, multiculturalism, and pluralism'" (Ginsberg & Lennox, 1996, p. 184) as "slogans" of the "victims revolution" (D'Souza, 1991, p. 17) is an excellent example that expressly targets women and forms of research that he believes to embody "futility" (p. 210). Second, planned attacks by the conservative right on women in the academy have been/are led by women who call themselves feminist and claim to be saving women from their radical academic sisters (Miller, 1991). An example of this type of work (even after Miller's 1991 discussion) that has gained much public attention is Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women (Sommers, 1994). Much of the work oversimplifies issues and uses sound bites like "a fair field" or "no favors" (Sommers, 1994, p. 78). Third, a subtle form of antifeminism uses methods of dismissal, marginalization, and labeling that have long been used to oppress women. Elaine Ginsburg and Sarah Lennox (1996) document ways in which research topics and methods are dismissed as invalid, grant funds are denied because topics are labeled 'cult like,' and work in general is labeled as irrational. Finally, there are fields that have not accepted diverse research philosophies and methodologies, whether feminist, naturalistic, poststructural, or others. In these fields, scholars who hope to be listened to and even given tenure continue to follow the language of truth, linearity, and objectivity that has served as codes for the elimination of diverse ways of understanding and interpreting the world. Ginsberg and Lennox (1996) have expressed the hope that the scholars that perpetuate these views are gradually retiring (or dying off); however, we would remind our feminist colleagues that the newly tenured may feel that they must also perpetuate the views for which they were rewarded and for which they are now the experts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mono-intellectualism. The discourse of accountability has most recently 'progressed' into one that holds academics responsible for all of society's problems (Macdonald, 2000). Scholars in the humanities and social sciences are labeled as endangering "America's prosperity, freedom, and safety" (Balch, 2001, p. 2) because we "have fallen under the influence of a variety of ideological sects" (p. 3). Some are considered to be no longer functioning "on the intellectual straight and narrow" (p. 3). Researchers who would bring in diverse ideas, constructions, and methods are labeled as sectarians, who would deny students the "profound lessons of truth and meaning" (Damon, 2000, p. 1). Conservative scholars have learned well the language of fear, proposing that these "types" need checks to control their fractious tendencies. The language perpetuates one view of the world, one way of thinking; that view is narrow, scientifically truth-oriented, Euro-American, and androcentric.

An example of this continued attack is a recent speech by Lynne Chaney titled "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It." From the mono-intellectual perspective that she has stressed for years, Chaney (2001) expresses concern that university faculty are not allowing students who support the 'war' on terrorism to feel comfortable. In the name of 'hearing both sides (pro-war and antiwar),' she again criticizes academics for attempts to understand diverse perspectives. She uses the 'moral relativism' sound bit and seems to be bothered that (in her interpretation) academia is the only American institution in which individuals are divided in their response to the so-called 'war.' Tragedy is even used by the conservative right, represented by Chaney, against diverse voices and interpretations of the world.

To this point our discussion has focused on languages and discourse practices that would silence diversity of thought and methodological tools generally in academic work. However, there are mono-intellectual critiques of qualitative research specifically. These critiques generally begin by asserting the traditional view of knowledge, arguments that assume the Enlightenment/Modernist will to truth, logic, objectivity, and correctness and cannot avoid falling into the circular argument created by the context itself (For examples, see the work of John Searle, Susan Haack, and Roger Kimball). Functioning from within the assumption of truth, no new analysis of qualitative methodologies is possible; no attempt is made to, however briefly, function from a different understanding of the world. From within the general societal move to the right organized by conservatives however, these arguments are legitimated.

In a recent critique, qualitative researchers are accused of constructing an environment in which their assumptions are not questioned, a kind of tactical method that uses confidence and assumes correctness. This critique is interesting in that the very arguments against social construction and qualitative inquiry used by the author describes a discourse method used by both antifeminist and mono-intellectuals. Critiques of qualitative inquiry attempt to blame the methodology for everything from problems with the tenure process, to poor quality research and publication without adequate review (all academic issues that existed with quantitative inquiry). Finally, this same critique directly states: "It is the epistemology of scholarship in haste." "It saves time" (Bauerlein, 2001, p. 12), displaying a total lack of understanding of qualitative methods. From these perspectives, we conclude that critics seem to be unable to examine qualitative inquiry without imposing their own truth orientations - simply do not understand the philosophy and methods - or understand and, with the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conservative right, hope to undermine and eliminate using sound bites, incorrect information, and disqualifying statements.

Constructing/Funding an Intellectual Network of Power

To their credit, members of the conservative right have recognized the power of organized, strategic use of money in a capitalist society. Discourses gain dominance when connected to those in power; however, using resources to create sites in which discourses are made prominent and unquestioned also creates a web of influence that gives power to the creators. Over the past 30 years, an organized, invasive effort to create and fund foundations that would infuse 'right thinking' throughout society and to produce a dominant form of intellectualism through the construction of 'think tanks' that would support 'right thinking' scholars has been undertaken. This massive agenda has been so successful that conservative foundations and think tanks are not only regular contributors, but often controllers of public discourse regarding legislation, legal decisions, and the construction and acceptance of knowledge.

Foundations. Although drawing probably the least public attention, foundations have become major players in the construction of U.S. society. Increasingly, foundation purposes have sought to generate political and social change, as well as functioning to provide philanthropic scholarships and support for the needy. After observing and learning to resent the role of foundations in funding civil rights and other causes that they considered liberal and dangerous, conservatives mounted an aggressive and overtly political movement to construct a network of privately funded foundations that would engage in the promotion of their purposes. Symposiums, leadership conferences, and scholarships were designed to train cadres of academics, activitists, and policy makers who would serve the conservative right. Books and other forms of scholarship that would (and do) influence public discourse were subsidized, advertised, and popularized. Examples of these include Dinesh D'Souza's Illiberal Education and the Heritage Foundation policy used by the Reagan administration during the early years (Lemann, 1997).

Conservative politicians even tried to 'defund the left' by pushing for the passage of extra limits (some already exist) to the political advocacy activities of organizations receiving federal funds. If the effort had been successful, severe limits would have been placed on foundations that support liberal causes because they are much less likely than conservative foundations to be funded through private sources (Lemann, 1997).

Leading the conservative movement are 12 foundations, founded within the past 30 years. In 1998, the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy conservatively reported that these foundations had provided over $89 million to support conservative academic programs and scholars during the recent 20 year period. Additionally, over $27 million have been used to construct conservative apparatuses in journalism, policy analysis, and the judiciary. Large amounts of additional money had supported the construction and maintenance of think tanks that would build a 'research foundation' for conservative discourses and policy change. Grants have been/are concentrated toward the conservative political agenda and are overtly political. The foundations have made extensive use of technology, have constructed a media apparatus that accepts conservative right discourses as expected, normal, and even representative of the majority of the public (Covington, 1998). This has generated an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

acceptance of the thought that labels one group as the righteous us and others as immoral, incompetent, and lazy.

On the nations campuses, the movement began by attacking multicultural curriculum and particular speech expectations. When these liberal perspectives had been marginalized, affirmative action was attacked. Gains by minority groups and women were taken on by the 'standards' police as they claimed that diversity and affirmative action were lowering academic standards. As the anti-diversity campaign grew successful, efforts were/are focused on intensifying training for greater numbers of young conservatives who would become leaders in all institutions of society. Additionally, right-wing legal groups associated with the foundations have applied a variety of pressures (e.g. threats of law suits, dissemination of reports) on university administrations to take actions that support the conservative agenda (Stefancic & Delgado, 1996).

Think Tanks: Countering the Academic Research Establishment. This organized purposeful move to the right could not have been accomplished without long-term strategies for the creation and support of conservative public intellectuals. This group of intellectuals has been cultivated by (1) providing large amounts of money to scholars that were willing to conduct their research in ways that supported the conservative agenda, (2) providing scholarships to campus leaders with conservative leanings, and (3) countering the need for and disqualifying universities by constructing centers or institutions, often referred to as think tanks, where research scholars could be trained and supported to do their work (Stefancic & Delgado, 1996).

Funds are made available through the think tanks to hire academic fellows who are expected to conduct research and publish, thus creating a somewhat academic position without the expectations of teaching, grading, or peer review. Books and articles are published by the think tanks or foundations and advertised extensively to the public as representing the best work on the topic. Although the work of conservatives like D'Souza or Murray (Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, supported by the Bradley Foundation) has not/does not undergo peer review before publication, busy congress persons or news editors accept the work issued by think tanks like the Heritage Foundation as authority (Stefancic & Delgado, 1996). However, the work generated by think tank scholars differs from university research in that there are no checks and balances. As examples: (1) Academic research is discussed through peer review and at research conferences; most of the work generated by think tank fellows (or their ghost writers) is presented to the media in sound bites, evading critical forms of intellectual analysis. (2) Diversity of thought is expected and promoted, at least to some extent, in university teaching and research; think tank fellows are hired because they agree with the conservative agenda. (3) The checks and balances in academia increase the likelihood that scholars conduct research before drawing conclusions; the opposite is found in think tanks.

More invasively, think tanks are as institutions influencing universities themselves as they are located within, or at least in interaction with specific universities. Conservatives working within these institutions have positioned themselves in ways that influence the checks and balances that exist in academia by providing more support and greater voice for faculty associated with them.

Example wealthy and influential conservative think tanks include: The Heritage Foundation, The American Enterprise Institute, The Cato Institute, The Hoover Institution, The Ethics and Public Policy Center, and The National Center for Policy Analysis.

The Future of Qualitative Research

From a simplistic and very practical position, our deconstructive analyses demonstrate (1) a lack of knowledge regarding diverse views of research and methods by those who are providing the critiques, integrated with (2) a fear of diversity and (3) the belief that scholarly "sound bites" and the confusions of content (usually inaccurately) can be used to control the values and expectations of others. More importantly, however, is the demonstrated "will to power" by those involved in critique. This "will to power" appears to be an attempt to regain power perceived to have been lost through broader societal changes during the civil rights and women's movements (as evidenced by specific historical actions designed to change universities, courts, and the media) that opened the door for the voices of those who have not traditionally been heard. Qualitative research is (accurately) associated with listening to the voices of all types of people (so also highly associated with the "evil" diversity). More specifically, attempts are being made to reinstitute and reconstruct apparatuses of power previously maintained through positivist/post-positivist science by using a rhetoric that would disqualify in the name of standards, rigor, and "sound science."

So what does this portend for the future of qualitative research? We believe it portends different activities and actions, depending on where one stands in the debate. First and foremost, it is unlikely that even the most vitriolic attacks on qualitative research would cause such research to "go away." Qualitative research, despite its link with social forces despised and castigated by the political right, seems to be alive and well and living everywhere. The evidence for its health is fairly sound. An increasing number of positions in educational research call for expertise in qualitative methods. The number of presentations at conferences has grown, from ten in 1980 at AERA to hundreds now. Whole conferences dedicated to qualitative research—whether considerations of method or actual case studies themselves—have been instituted, and have been ongoing for years. Qualitative research has found its way even into mainstream and core journals, and several journals in both education (e.g., the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, now 14 years old, and the Anthropology and Education Quarterly, more than 20 years old) and the social sciences more broadly (e.g., Qualitative Inquiry, now 8 years old, and Qualitative Sociology, nearly 14 years old; and others) are dedicated solely to qualitative research. An increasing number of books in educational research are written on subject matter which is partially or completely comprised of qualitative research. Courses are offered on a regular basis at a large proportion of the research-extensive universities in the country on qualitative research, and many such institutions even have entire sequences of qualitative research courses. It seems unlikely, in the face of growing interest, burgeoning research and methods literatures, and the invention and adaptation of new methods almost annually, that qualitative research will wither in the face of the political right's efforts to demonize it along with the other discursive "demons" it has created.

Because, however, qualitative research has enjoyed such a resurgence does not mean that the discourses of demonization and denigration should be ignored. Quite the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

opposite. In order to maintain some semblance of freedom of speech and ideas on campuses, and in order to recognize, honor and institutionalize multiple ways of knowing, strategic actions have to be mounted to preserve the freedom to pursue research by whatever means gives us social insight and deeper social and educational understanding. That suggests that qualitative researchers need to think strategically about both protecting their academic freedom to conduct research in appropriate ways, and about ways to enter and counter the civic discourses fostered by the political right and ultra-conservative forces in the country. Several strategies suggest themselves, depending on the social location of the qualitative researcher.

Curricular Strategies

Researchers wishing to keep their options open—including, perhaps, even quantitative researchers who wish to see their students trained broadly in methods—will support the teaching of qualitative research methods at their own institutions. Qualitative researchers will make themselves available for technical help to students and faculty alike who need their help and consultation. Openness and approachability are highly-prized characteristics on campuses today, and qualitative researchers who will work with students other than their own, and who will teach students from outside their own departments, do much by simple example to create a climate of free and open discourse about research, its purposes and strategies.

In turn, supporting others who teach such courses is a critical strategy. In some departments, there may be only one individual engaged in teaching or using qualitative methods in his/her own work. To the extent that community of such researchers can be created, however informally, on campuses, support is amplified for qualitative research.

Research Strategies

Several strategic and tactical moves suggest themselves here. First and foremost, qualitative researchers would do well to seek energetically a wide variety of outlets for their work. In research-extensive universities, in particular, the emphasis is on publishing in "core", or mainstream journals, or in those journals which have associated with them "impact factors" or "impact statistics". While it is important to a whole variety of institutional processes to have one's work appear in such journals, it is no less important to address other audiences as well. In addressing a wider variety of audiences (in addition to the scholarly or disciplinary audiences to which core journals speak), speaking to practitioners and to policy personnel not only enlarges the range of connections between scholarly work and practice, but also creates new audiences for qualitative research. Stakeholding audiences frequently find well-done qualitative research compelling, insightful, and accessible. Reaching out for those audiences as well as disciplinary colleagues can go far in teaching the value and utility of qualitative research for educational practice and policy.

Second, in research extensive universities, in particular, the scramble for external monies which will support research, development and training activities is powerful and ceaseless. In addition, many more agencies, institutes, foundations and corporations exist which are willing to grant money to universities to conduct research, largely because contracting such work out obviates the necessity for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

institutes, agencies or other corporate bodies to hire and maintain their own research staffs. In some instances—e.g., the federal government, NSF, the Ford or Rockefeller Foundations—while there are preferred contractors—that is, individuals who have set up long-term relationships, and whose work is respected and funded frequently—in other instances, agencies and foundations funding research are far newer, have less visibility, and therefore, neither their purposes, backers or agency philosophies are well known. Some institutes, foundations or groups funding research on campuses today may have agendas which act in the long term to undermine the free flow of ideas and the pluralistic methods and epistemologies which have come to characterize 21st century university life. Scholars and researchers seeking support for their work would do well to investigate the sources of their funding well prior to entering into contracts with some of them. The foundations and institutes mentioned in the previous section of this work are some of those whose intentions toward multi- and pluri-culturalism are inimical, if not outright subversive. The central point here is that principles matter. And because politics is said to make strange bedfellows, political bedfellows matter. A given scholar's work may be but a small part of a funding plan; it is the larger commitment of the foundation, agency, institute or corporation which count when determining who might support one's intended research. Research which is highjacked for some political agenda which runs counter to a researcher's own personal and professional social commitments is probably not worth the dollars taken for it.

Institutional Strategies

At least two strategies could be useful here. First, qualitative researchers need to be supported, particularly vis-à-vis the promotion and tenure process. Faculty interested in maintaining and enlarging the community of ideas within a university will serve willing on promotion and tenure committees which evaluate faculty for retention, and will act to ensure that such faculty are given fair and meaningful review. Fair and meaningful review means that others familiar with the methods and forms of the work—as well as the specialties of such researchers—are those who will be asked. Although it is rarely ever discussed openly, the practice of eliciting reviews from those who are hostile to the work being evaluated, or who have no familiarity with the methods employed, or who have no training in the criteria for qualitative research is one of the great inequities of promotion and tenure processes on some campuses. Faculty sympathetic to, and familiar with, the work of such faculty should be those who serve as advocates for the untenured individual, and such persons should also have great weight in nominating reviewers who are appropriate, and who can render fair and balanced judgments.

A second institutional strategy is to seek out opportunities to recognize those who do qualitative research and do it well. Far too often, especially on multiversity campuses, those who work in the hard sciences, and who work with quantitative methods, receive the lion's share of awards, prizes and other forms of recognition. Identifying superb qualitative researchers, and making certain that they are recognized for high-quality work, is a useful strategy for bringing to the attention of the University community the idea that multiple forms of research work goes on within the community, and that all of it is valued highly.

Public and Civic Discourse Strategies

Academics in general have withdrawn from public and civic discourses circulating around social policy. The reasons for that are historical and reasonably clear. The strong post-WWII push for specialization and its concomitant impetus toward fragmentation into rather rigidly-defined disciplinary boundaries; the creation and growth of professional associations which further defined and contained disciplines; diminishing state funds which might support higher education and the accompanying necessity to support research efforts with external dollars; the rapid growth of Federal support for research; promotion and tenure efforts which reward contributions to one's discipline before contributions to a public discourse; a growing discontent with higher education as expressed in the media; and the diminution of the role of "public intellectuals" more broadly (Jacoby, 1987); all have worked in concert with other larger and smaller forces to encourage the retreat of faculty from public life into academic and disciplinary life. To the astonishment of faculty—who tend, as a group, to lean leftward and to be characterized as liberals—into the public culture/public discourse vacuum has moved a strident and mean-spirited political right. This right is not unitary, of course; it is composed of a constellation of institutes, coalitions, political action groups, foundations, political figures (as well as those who silently fill their re-election war chests), and urban terrorists. Nor are its messages unitary; they run the gamut from "murder doctors to save fetuses" to culture warriors, decrying the death of a canon which was never fixed or static (and which itself has undergone criticism, systematic languishing, and several rebirths into different mutations). What can academics do when they either wish to recapture discursive space for more liberal social goals, or even merely defend qualitative research as a valid and meaningful way to proceed with investigating social and educational life? Two possibilities seem well worth pursuing.

First and foremost, researchers who wish to re-enter public life and public discourse might well consider devoting a portion of their academic writing to non-scholarly, non-disciplinary audiences. There are a number of critical outlets for such writing, although writing for public audiences will demand that scholar-authors write in a very different discursive style from that normally considered appropriate for journals. Ordinary, or "natural", language, is accessible to anyone who can read a newspaper, and scholars will need to adapt their language system to the natural language of a newspaper (or other media they might choose). Newspaper, however, are a good place to begin learning how to accomplish the switch in language systems. Newspapers generally impose word- and space-limits on editorial and op-ed opinion pieces, and so force authors to be concise, and to limit themselves to major points. Convoluted, complex sentences are frequently edited out, so authors would be wise—in the interests of not having critical material cut from their arguments—to frame such material in shorter declarative sentences. For authors who are fortunate enough to reside on campuses which have strong journalism schools, asking the help of a fellow professor is a straightforward and relatively painless way of having a professional review and make suggestions on any piece which is about to be offered to a newspaper. National newspapers, too, offer public forums for debating issues, and the New York Times, USA Today, the Christian Science Monitor, the Wall Street Journal, all offer opportunities for at least letters to the editor which are succinct, well-reasoned, and carefully supported. Those newspapers reach a national audience, and can have some impact on shaping public discourses around social goals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Second, scholars who wish to enter into the arena of civic debate and discourse might do well to search for other opportunities. The "My Turn" column of Newsweek Magazine is one such opportunity. The writers are all non-staff members of the magazine, and essays (limited to approximately 750 words) are selected on a wide and diverse set of topics, from a wide and diverse set of authors: housewives, independent businessmen, public school teachers, physicians, construction workers, parents of small children, teenage computer experts. The list of individuals contributing is wide, and cuts across professional lines, color lines, income lines, age lines—virtually every stratification in American society. The essays themselves take up quotidian concerns and lofty principles alike in American life, and everything in between. Other news magazines also offer the opportunity for non-journalists to contribute to ongoing public dialogues, and trade and professional, but non-scholarly, outlets also provide a chance for researchers to make their case for research, for social change which is research-based, or for simply arguments about proposed public policies.

A third possibility for those seeking opportunities to address non-scholarly audiences is usually provided by universities and their public speakers' bureaus. Most universities of any size maintain an ongoing list of their faculty's areas of expertise, and when requests come to public relations offices making a request for an expert who can shed some light on a issue, or a proposed policy, the university makes available a list of faculty who have such expertise. Scholars who wish to become available for television news and sound "bites", or for more lengthy commentary, would do well to register with their campuses offices, listing expertise carefully, but fully. Universities also fulfil this function for various civic clubs, groups and affiliations nearby: the Rotary Club, the Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis International, various local training and development seminars, and the like. While it is not always possible to speak on the topics nearest and dearest to our hearts, we can often speak—in non-research terminology, with natural language—to groups of businessmen and women, and to individuals and groups which have power with city and regional governments (whether elected to such groups or not). Civic and public dialogue can begin close to home, with local issues under debate throughout even a small community.

A fourth possibility for reaching a non-scholarly audience is to write for journals which are non-disciplinary, but which nevertheless, reach deep into the intellectual community on and off campuses. Daedalus is one such journal; The American Scholar is another.

One critical issue with respect to reaching non-scholarly audiences is whether or not such work will be valued by one's department or college. This is a very real problem, at least on some campuses. But such writing also provides a powerful opportunity to create a "scholarly portfolio" which highlights some of this work, permits it to read by others, and provides for some impact statement. In this way, non-scholarly audience cultivation can be seen in its broadest and most important light: as a contribution from the scholarly community to the public policy discourse arena. Department heads and other young scholars who see senior, productive scholars contributing to such public discourses may themselves be moved to enter into the political arena, where ideas are often harshly fought.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions

First, from a simple and very practical position, our deconstructive analyses demonstrate (1) a lack of knowledge regarding diverse views of research and methods by those who are providing the criticisms. As reported earlier, in the quotation from Miller, "qualitative research has been criticized for yielding little that can be generalized...too much useless work is done under the bannef of qualitative research" (Miller, 1999, p. A17). Integrated with that lack of knowledge (or lack of familiarity) is (2) an underlying fear of diversity and (3) the belief that scholarly "sound bites" and the confusions of content can be used to control the values and expectations of others. More importantly, however, is the demonstrated "will to power" by those involved in critique. This "will to power" appears to be an attempt to regain power perceived to have been lost through broader societal changes during the civil rights and women's movements (as evidenced by specific historical actions designed to change universities, courts, and the media) that opened the door for the voices of those who have not traditionally been heard. Qualitative research is (accurately) associated with listening to the voices of all types of people (so also highly associated with the "evil" diversity). The inescapable conclusion is that attempts are being made to reinstitute and reconstruct apparatuses of power previously maintained through positivist/post-positivist science by using a rhetoric that would disqualify qualitative research in the name of standards, accountability, rigor, and "sound science."

More than this, however, is clear from these analyses. It is clear to us that far, far more material is out there, and available for analysis. Our analyses, while well-rounded, does not yet include deep and intensive searches on the Web for materials which are available, but which might not be transparently obvious in first searches. Clearly, fine-grained searches are apt to yield even more material, from sources, perhaps, which we have not identified as yet.

Another conclusion which may be drawn is that even more penetrating deconstructive analyses might be conducted. For instance, a formal content analysis of some, or all, of these materials, might yield categories of discourse which we have not yet considered. Furthermore, analyses of the latent as well as the manifest content might uncover embedded messages which lead to even further insights (Krippendorf, 1980). There may well be, in other words, messages which have yet to be uncovered and/or deconstructed.

Further, this material is ripe for a Foucauldian policy archaeology (Foucault, 1972; Scheurich, 1997). Since much of the material is intended to shape both public opinion and public discourse, and at the same time, to create a policy climate which seems to be characterized by inevitability, it falls fairly directly into the policy arena. In particular, the first and third archaeological steps would be illuminating here. Those are, "the study of the social construction of specific education and social problems", which would tell analysts something about how, for instance, the "problem" of multiculturalism became constructed as inimical to the "American way of life" (whatever that is), and "the study of the social construction of the range of acceptable policy solutions" (Scheurich, 1997, p. 97) which might lend us a deep understanding of how the shift occurred from acceptable policy solutions being proposed from both the political left and the political right, to having acceptable policy solutions emanate only from the political right. An intensive policy archaeology of

even a subset or segment of the materials we have gathered here could be instructive regarding how the discourses of demonization began to be structured and constructed.

A final conclusion we have drawn is that research is not only political, it has never been more politicized than in the present. To the extent that we abandon the Holy Grail of objectivity and move toward understanding the uses to which research is being deployed—both research qua inquiry, and research as a weapon of policy discourse and policy construction—the more effectively we are able to enter the public discourse arena, and defend not only qualitative research, but also its ability to penetrate the social veils which mask oppressive, inequitable and unjust social practices. Recognizing both the political and politicized nature of research discourses circulating provides additional sophistication regarding the shape and form of our own discourses, furthers the ability of scholars to "speak in different registers" (i.e., shift discursive structures to vary with the audience being addressed), and has the power to circumvent a one-sided public policy discourse now being dominated by the political right.

References

Bauerlein, Mark (2001). Social constructionism: Philosophy for the academic workplace. Partisan Review, 68:2, pp. 2-13.

Berry, J.M. (1997). The interest group society. New York, NY: Longman.

Bérubé, Michael and Nelson, Cary, Eds. (1995). Higher education under fire: Politics, economics and the crisis of the humanities. New York: Routledge.

Blach, S.H. (2001). Rediscovering liberal education: A case for reform in America's universities. The Insider, August 2001, No. 286. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

Bloom, Allan (1987). The closing of the American mind: How higher education has failed democracy and impoverished the souls of today's students. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Broder, D. (July 18, 1993). Christian coalition, shifting tactics to lobby against Clinton budget. Washington Post.

Chaney, L.V. (2001). Defending civilization: How our universities are failing America and what can be done about it. Washington, DC: The American Council of Trustees and Alumni.

Clark, V., Garner, S.N., Higonnet, M., & Katrak. (1996). Introduction. In V. Clark, S.N. Garner, M., Higonnet, & Katrak, K. (Eds.), Anti-feminism in the academy, pp. ix-xix. New York, NY: Routledge.

Coontz, S. (1997). The way we really are: Coming to terms with America's changing families. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Costain, A.N. (1992). Inviting women's rebellion. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Covington, S. (1998). How conservative philanthropies and think tanks transform U.S. Policy. Covert Action Quarterly, No. 63.

Craig, B.H., & O'Brien, D.M. (1993). Abortion and American politics. Chatham, JN: Chatham House.

Crawford, A. (1980). Thunder on the right. New York, NY: Pantheon.

D'Souza, Dinesh (1991). Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus. New York: The Free Press.

Damon, W. (June 19, 2000). Counterrevolution in the classroom. Stanford University, CA: Hoover Institution Weekly Essay. www-hoover.stanford.edu/publicaffairs/we/current/damon_0600.html

Dowie, M. (1995). Losing ground. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Ellis, ( ). Literature lost: Social agendas and the corruption of the humanities.

Faludi, Susan (1991). Backlash: The undeclared war against American women. New York: Crown Publishers.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language. Trans. By A.M. Sheridan Smith. NY: Pantheon Books.

Ginsberg, E., & Lennox, S. (1996). Antifeminism in scholarship and publishing. In V. Clark, S.N. Garner, M., Higonnet, & Katrak, K. (Eds.), Anti-feminism in the academy, pp. 169-199. New York, NY: Routledge.

Graff, Gerald (1992). Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American education. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Guba, Egon G. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Herman, E.S. (1981). Corporate control, corporate power. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Herrnstein, Richard J. and Murray, Charles (1994). The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life. New York: The Free Press.

Hunter, James Davison (1991). Culture wars: The struggle to define America. New York: Basic Books.

"Is the curriculum biased? A statement of the National Association of Scholars" (2001, January). National Association of Scholars, available at www.nas.org/statements/biased.htm

Jacoby, Russell (1987). The last intellectuals: American culture in the age of academe. New York: Basic Books.

Kimball, Roger (1990). Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education.
New York: Harper and Row.

Kincheloe, Joe L., Steinberg, Shirley R., and Gresson, Aaron D., III, Eds. (1996). Measured lies: The bell curve examined. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Koertge, Noretta (1994). "Are feminists alienating women from the sciences?" Chronicle of Higher Education, September 14.

Kors, and Silvergate, . The shadow university: The betrayal of liberty on America's campuses.

Lawton, K. (July 20, 1992). The new religious face(s) of the religious right. Christianity Today, pp. 42-45.

Lemann, N. (1997). Citizen: An increasingly powerful agent in American life is also one of the least noticed. The Atlantic online. The Atlantic Monthy Digital Edition. www.theatlantic.com/issues/97feb/5013c/5013c.htm.

Levine, Lawrence W. (1996). The opening of the American mind: Canons, culture, and history. Boston: Beacon Press.

MacDonald, H. (2000). The burden of bad ideas: How modern intellectuals misshape our society. New York, NY: Manhatten Institute for Policy Research.

Miller, D.W. (1999). "The black hole of education research: Why do academic studies play such a minimal role in efforts to improve the schools?" Chronicle of Higher Education, August 6, p. A17.

Miller, N.K. (1991). Getting personal: Feminist occasions and other autobiographical acts. New York, NY: Routledge.

Moen, M. (1992). The transformation of the Christian Right. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

"NAS celebrates its rising influence as national conference returns to New York City", NAS...Update, 11:1, 2000, pp. 1, 5-6.

Short, Thomas (1992). What shall we defend? Academic Questions, National Association of Scholars. Available at www.nas.org/statements.defend.html

Sommers, C.H. (1994). Who stole feminism? How women have betrayed women. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Stefancic, J., & Delgado, R. (1996). No mercy: How conservative think tanks and foundations changed America's social agenda. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wilson, Bradford P. (1999, Winter). The culture wars in higher education. Phi Kappa Phil Journal: National Forum, 79: 1, pp. 14-18.

---

[1] Graff's (1992) arguments stand in complete contrast to Ellis's (19). While Graff argues that the 'culture wars' have revivified interest in the arts and humanities as a place where important arguments occur, Ellis counters that 'social agendas' have torn apart the fabric of the humanities as a uniquely Western work of art. Outside evaluators of this set of competing constructions of the result of the culture wars—such as the authors of this current work—can, from one perspective, see the competition as between the political left's 'take' on the culture wars, and the political right's 'take' on the same set of phenomena.

[2] Others may disagree with our particular formulations, and attributions for originating points. Our assertions are simply based on the origins of documents and texts—books, journal articles, conference papers, and the like—and the nationalities of authors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034761

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH AND THE RADICAL RIGHT: CATS, DOGS AND OTHER NATURAL ENEMIES	
Author(s): Yvonna S. Lincoln. and GAILE S. CANNELLA	
Corporate Source: Texas A&M University	Publication Date: Nov. 5-6, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Y S Lincoln	Printed Name/Position/Title: Yvonna S. Lincoln, Professor
Organization/Address: EAHR Dept., Texas A&M University, 4226 TAMU, COLLEGE STATIONS, TX 77843-4226	Telephone: 979-845-2701 FAX: 690-7156
	E-Mail Address: ysl@tamu.edu Date: 1-21-03